



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,892	11/20/2003	Robert A. Koch	BS02301CON2 (KS-02301)	9410
7590 Scott P. Zimmerman P.O. Box 3822 Cary, NC 27519	01/28/2008		EXAMINER DESIR, PIERRE LOUIS	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/28/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/717,892

Applicant(s)

KOCH ET AL.

Examiner

Pierre-Louis Desir

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, as related to the double-patenting rejection, that because the feature of "monitoring a duration of said call traversing the service-providing network" is not recited in U.S. Patent No. 7,127,051, this feature would not be anticipated nor obviated by the claims of U.S. Patent 7,127,051.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, Examiner wants to point out that the double-patenting rejection is an obviousness double-patenting rejection. Also, Applicant is referred to claim 3 of U.S. Patent 7,127,051, it is disclosed that the advanced telephony service comprises of call logging services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to immediately envision that a call logging service would read on the limitation of monitoring duration of a call traversing the serving-providing network.

Applicant argues on page 9 of the Remarks that Fuller and Jones operate entirely opposite from the pending claims.

Examiner respectfully disagrees while understanding applicant's arguments. First, Examiner wants to point out that broadly written claims are broadly interpreted by Examiner. In this case, the claim reads, "virtual telephone number associated with a dialed telephone number in the native network." As can be seen, in fuller, a caller dials a single directory number (i.e., a dialed telephone number), and this number is associated with a virtual telephone number (i.e.,

MSISDN). Applicant discloses on page 9 that the claimed features are fully explained in paragraph 31 of the current application; however, those specific features are not present in the claims' language.

Also, in the previous remarks received by the office on 02/26/2007 that the claims have been amended to recite similar features to those already allowed in U.S. application 10/245518. In response, the current application claim's recitation is a broad recitation of the allowed language of application 10/245518.

Applicants further state that the prima facie cases all require an impermissible change to Fuller's principle of operation. As the above paragraphs explained, Fuller's principle of operation is to convert a "common virtual fixed line number into two or more MSISDNs. In Fuller, then, a caller dials the "common virtual fixed line number" and that number is converted to an MSISDN. In the pending claims, however, continue applicants, "the virtual number is associated with a dialed telephone number in the native transport network." Because the patent law prohibits changing a principle of operation to support a prima facie case, any proposed combination involving Fuller "teaches away" and cannot support the 103 rejections of the pending claims.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is not clear to Examiner how the disclosure of a caller dials the "common virtual fixed line number and that number is converted to an MSISDN" teaches away from the disclosure, "the virtual number is associated with a dialed telephone number in the native transport network." Applicants is respectfully invited to provide further disclosure for that matter. Also, a prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does

not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed....” *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 5-19 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 7127051. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 and claim 11 of the present application describe a method and system comprising receiving a call directed to a virtual telephone number in a service-providing network, the call originating from a native transport network having limited capability of providing advanced telephony service, the virtual telephone number associated with dialed telephone number in the native transport network, the service-providing network providing intelligent services to said call, wherein the virtual telephone number utilizes the intelligent services provided by the service-providing network; routing said call to the separate native transport network for termination; and monitoring a duration of said call traversing the service-providing network. Whereas, claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7127051 describes a system comprising: a native transport network in communication with said telephony device and in communication with a service-providing network, the native transport network having limited capability of providing the advanced telephony service, the service-providing network providing the advanced telephony service; and a database in communication with said native transport network, wherein the database associates a virtual telephone number with a dialed telephone number of the telephony device, the virtual telephone number utilizing the advanced telephony service provided by the service-providing network; the native transport network routing a call directed to the virtual

telephone number to the service-providing network; and receiving the advanced telephony service from the service-providing network, wherein the service-providing network then routes the call to its terminating network destination. Although the independent claims do not disclose the step of monitoring duration of a call traversing the service-providing network, claim 3 of U.S. Patent 7,127,051, discloses that the advanced telephony service comprises of call logging services. Therefore, it would have been obvious tone of ordinary skill in the art to immediately envision that a call logging service would read on the limitation of monitoring duration of a call traversing the serving-providing network.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 20 discloses a computer program product, this recitation was not described in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 20 discloses a computer program product. This disclosure relates to non-statutory matter.

Note: For the process of examination, this disclosure will be interpreted as a method.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller (US Patent Number 6,775,546) in view of Jones et al. (US Patent Number 6,195,422).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, Fuller discloses a method for monitoring communications usage (Figures 2 and 3), comprising:

receiving a call (step 300 - Figure 3; column 8, line 55) directed to a virtual telephone number ("common" or "virtual fixed line number" column 3, lines 31-38) in a service-providing network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 41, 42, 43, 44), the call originating



from a native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) having limited capability (capability is fairly characterized as "limited") of providing advanced telephony service (step 303 -Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14; column 5, lines 9-27), the virtual telephone number associated with dialed telephone number in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database - column 8, line 48. HLR 44 includes a database - column 5, line 30), the service-providing network providing intelligent services to said call (for example: voice mail (VMS), call forwarding, etc - column 6, lines 45-50; Figure 2), wherein the virtual telephone number utilizes the intelligent services provided by the service-providing network for example: voice mail (VMS), call forwarding, etc - column 6, lines 45-50; Figure 2); routing said call to the separate native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) for termination (step 303 -Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14). (See also column 5, lines 9-27).

The two networks are considered "separate" as claimed because the service-providing network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 41, 42, 43, 44) is wireline network while the native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) is wireless network as depicted in Figure 2.

Although Fuller discloses billing or charging for the call in a fixed-to-mobile basis (column 10, lines 15-17), Fuller does not specifically disclose monitoring the duration of the call

traversing the service-providing network as claimed by applicant.

However, Jones et al. discloses a method including monitoring a duration of a call for billing purposes. After accepting a call (step S 14 - Figure 4) the service-providing system/network (CCS 18), routes the call (step S 16 - Figure 4), monitors the duration of the call and generates a bill (step S 17 - Figure 4); see column 14, lines 4-19 (especially line 8). Jones et al.'s method has the advantage of providing for better accuracy of billing since the call is monitored and timed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor the duration of the call in Fuller's invention as suggested by himself by teaching billing or charging for the call because such monitoring provides for accuracy of billing.

Regarding claim 2, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, as explained above the combination discloses monitoring a status of said call (monitoring for billing: step S 17 - Figure 4; see column 14, lines 4-19 (especially line 8) - Jones et al.).

Regarding claim 3, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, as explained above Fuller discloses routing said call to an original destination via the separate native transport network (step 303 - Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14; column 5, lines 9-27).

Regarding claim 5, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Fuller discloses that the service-providing network is a network selected from the group consisting of a wireline network, a wireless network, and a packet-

switching network. For example, wireline/fixed-line network (depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 41, 42, 43, 44).

Regarding claim 6, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Fuller discloses associating the virtual telephone number to a wireless telephone number existing in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database - column 8, line 48. HLR44 includes a database - column 5, line 30).

Regarding claim 7, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Fuller discloses associating the virtual telephone number to "another" telephone number existing in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database - column 8, line 48. HLR 44 includes a database - column 5, line 30).

Regarding claim 8, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Fuller discloses that the native transport network is a network selected from the group consisting of a wireline network, a wireless network, and a packet-switching

network. For example, wireless network (depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47)

Regarding claim 10, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Fuller further discloses billing the subscriber (user; account) based on the duration of the call ("billing system 49 [...] generates billing information for charges incurred by the user of the handset 21" - column 5, lines 44-46; "billing system 49 is controlled to charge the common number account for the fixed-to-mobile leg of the call" - column 10, lines 15-17). Jones et al. also discloses billing the subscriber (customer) based on a duration of the call (step S 19 - Figure 4).

Regarding claim 11, Fuller discloses a system for monitoring communications usage providing an intelligent service (Figures 2 and 3), the system operative (Applicants are respectfully invited to change the language "operative" to "comprising") to receive a call (step 300 - Figure 3; column 8, line 55) directed to a virtual telephone number ("common" or "virtual fixed line number" column 3, lines 31-38) in a service-providing network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 41, 42, 43, 44), the call originating from a native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) having limited capability (capability is fairly characterized as "limited") of providing advanced telephony service (step 303 - Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14; column 5, lines 9-27), the virtual telephone number associated with dialed telephone number in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP

43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database - column 8, line 48. HLR 44 includes a database - column 5, line 30), the service-providing network providing intelligent services to said call (for example: voice mail (VMS), call forwarding, etc - column 6, lines 45-50; Figure 2), wherein the virtual telephone number utilizes the intelligent services provided by the service-providing network (for example: voice mail (VMS), call forwarding, etc - column 6, lines 45-50; Figure 2); route said call to the separate native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) for termination (step 303 -Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14). (See also column 5, lines 9-27).

The two networks are considered "separate" as claimed because the service-providing network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 41, 42, 43, 44) is wireline network while the native transport network (the network depicted in Figure 2 at least including elements 21, 30, 47) is wireless network as depicted in Figure 2.

Although Fuller discloses billing or charging for the call in a fixed-to-mobile basis (column 10, lines 15-17), Fuller does not specifically disclose monitoring the duration of the call traversing the service-providing network as claimed by applicant.

However Jones et al. discloses a method including monitoring a duration of a call for billing purposes. After accepting a call (step S 14 - Figure 4) the service-providing system/network (CCS 18), routes the call (step S 16 -Figure 4), monitors the duration of the call and generates a bill (step S 17 -Figure 4); see column 14, lines 4-19 (especially line 8). Jones et al.'s method has the advantage of providing for better accuracy of billing since the call is monitored and timed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor the duration of the call in Fuller's invention as suggested by himself by teaching billing or charging for the call because such monitoring provides for accuracy of billing.

Regarding claim 12, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). In addition, as explained above the combination discloses the intelligent service also monitors a status of the call (monitoring for billing: step S 17 - Figure 4; see column 14, lines 4-19 (especially line 8) -Jones et al.).

Regarding claim 13, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, as explained above Fuller discloses routing said call to an original destination via the separate native transport network (step 303 -Figure 3; column 10, lines 12-14; column 5, lines 9-27).

Regarding claim 14, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). In addition, Fuller discloses (a database i.e., SCP 43 / HLR 44 either singularly or in combination) associating the virtual telephone number to "another" telephone number existing in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database - column 8, line 48. HLR 44 includes a database - column 5, line 30. Therefore, SCP 43 / HLR 44 either singularly or in combination read as the claimed database).

Regarding claim 16, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). In, addition, Fuller's service-providing network is fairly characterized as an advanced intelligent network as claimed. Furthermore, Jones et al.'s service-providing network is an advanced intelligent network as claimed (column 5, line 10).

Regarding claims 18-19, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). In addition, Fuller discloses wherein the service-providing network modifies caller information associated with the call (messages accompanying the call). (The telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57). The call is not routed back to the service-providing network in an endless loop because the call is properly routed/forwarded (column 6, lines 45-50; Figure 2).

9. Claims 9, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller (US Patent Number 6,775,546) in view of Jones et al. (US Patent Number 6195,422) as applied to claims I and 11 above, and further in view of Dent (US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0050100).

Regarding claim 9, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). However, Fuller and Jones et al. fail to specifically disclose billing a telecommunications provider of said native transport network for said monitoring. Dent discloses a method including monitoring a duration of a call (steps 206-212 - Figure 4) for

billing purposes (step 214 - Figure 4); see paragraph 0027. "Apart from the economic benefits, communication quality benefits from the ability to access a larger number of antenna sites 12 allowing more frequent use of transmit and receive diversity to improve communications" - paragraph 0028. Another advantage is providing for better accuracy of billing since the call is monitored and timed.

In addition, Dent discloses billing a telecommunications provider of a native transport network for said monitoring; see paragraph 0016, especially last sentence, paragraph 0027, especially last three sentences, and paragraph 0026, especially last two sentences. Dent's method has several advantages such as cross-bill (paragraph 0026, last two sentences), and enhanced roaming services (paragraph 0006).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fuller and Jones et al. for billing a telecommunications provider of a native transport network for said monitoring for the advantage of cross-billing and allowing enhanced roaming services.

Regarding claim 15, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). In addition, Fuller discloses (a database i.e., SCP 43 / HLR 44 either singularly or in combination) associating the virtual telephone number to a voice-based telephone number existing in the native transport network (the telephony device includes an identifier: MSISDN - column 3, lines 39-40. "There is an association in the switching network between this number and the MSISDN, such that incoming calls made to the virtual fixed-line number are translated to the MSISDN number" - column 2, lines 3-6. "The SCP 43 ... converts the number to an MSISDN" - column 5, line 57; see also column 8, lines 55-57. SCP 43 includes a database -



column 8, line 48. HLR 44 includes a database - column 5, line 30. Therefore, SCP 43 / HLR 44 either singularly or in combination read as the claimed database).

However, Fuller and Jones et al. fail to specifically disclose that the voice-based telephone number is packet voice-based telephone number as claimed.

In analogous art, Dent discloses that the service-providing network includes a packet-switching network (IP-based communications or Internet network -paragraph 0025, especially last line).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a packet-switching network capabilities with corresponding packet voice-based telephone number in Fuller and Jones et al.'s invention because this would enable Internet access as suggested by Dent which is very desirable.

Regarding claim 17, Fuller and Jones et al. disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). However, Fuller and Jones et al. fail to specifically disclose a packet-switching network as claimed.

In analogous art, Dent discloses that the service-providing network includes a packet-switching network (IP-based communications or Internet network -paragraph 0025, especially last line).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a packet-switching network capabilities in Fuller and Jones et al.'s invention because this would enable Internet access as suggested by Dent which is very desirable.

*Conclusion*

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Louis Desir whose telephone number is (571) 272-7799. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM- 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Application/Control Number:  
10/717,892  
Art Unit: 2617

Page 18

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Pierre-Louis Desir  
01/21/2008



**JOSEPH FIELD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**